

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/768,904	01/24/2001	Lap-Wai Chow	B-3964 618029-8	4228	
36716	7590 12/23/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY			NGUYEN, JOSEPH H		
5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2100 LOS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679		11E 2100	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2815		

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/768,904	CHOW ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
-	Joseph Nguyen	2815	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 19 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearance (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application in the second	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of	•	o final rejection, which eve	uria latar In na
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extended the final Office action; or	ension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note because of the latest the issue of the latest the	pelow);		
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or s	implifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):	•	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	d amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w	t(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided bel	o)⊠ will be entered low or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-8,17 and 18</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>23-24</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>9-16,19 and 20</u> .	•		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:			
<del></del>			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The preamble was not overlooked. As stated in the final rejection, the preamble does not further structurally limit the claim. At best, it is a statement of intended use and it is applicant's burden to prove that the applied art cannot function in the manner claimed therein. There is presently no evidence that the prior art cannot function in the manner claimed. Furthermore, with regard to applicant's second point, the bare recitation "electrically isolated" is broad and clearly does not structurally distinguish over Lee et al wherein the metal 42 is clearly "electrically isolated" from the contact region 38b by insulating film 39 and field oxide film 33.

ALLAN R. WILSON PRIMARY EXAMINER